IMT Nuremberg Archives

H – 928

International Court of Justice

H0928-0002

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

Friday, 31 May 1946

COMMISSIONERS:

Mr. Igor V. Rasumov
Captain Joseph Tubridy

THE S.D.

(The Commission convened at 1115 hours.)

HELMUT KNOCHEN, a witness, took the stand and testified as follows:

BY CAPTAIN TUBRIDY:

Q Your full name, please?

A Helmut Knochen.

Q Will you repeat this oath after me:

I swear by God, the Almighty and Omniscient, that I will speak the pure truth and will withhold and add nothing.

(The witness repeated the oath.)

DR. HANS GAWLIK: I questioned this witness concerning the duties, goals and methods of the S.D. in France, as well as of the parts that made up the S.D. in France. I want to state definitely that I will limit my questions to France.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q What was your duty in France?

A I was from May, 1942, Chief of the Security Police and the S.D.

Q What job did you have from 1940 to 1942 in France?

A I was in charge of an office of the Security Ministry and which at that time was organized by Standartenfuehrer Thomas.

Q How long did you have that job?

A I had that job until my appointment as chief of the Security Police, in May, 1942.

Q From when?

A After the occupation of Paris in June, 1940.

Q Under whom was the Police in France?

A The Police Administration was under the military command.

Q During the whole time?

A From 1940 to 1942 entirely but with the naming of a higher S.S. and police official, part of the police duties went over to the S.S. and Polizeifuehrer.

Q ~~What~~ Who was your superior officer as chief of the Security Police and S.D. in France?

A The higher S.S. and Police Chief, General Oberg.

Q What units were under you as chief of the Security Police and S.D. in France?

A It was usually the security commandants that were at the place, at the office of the French regional prefects. That is, the chief of a certain region. There were 16 commanders.

Q I would like now to know from you the relation of these security police and S.D. in France. Was that a united group or did the S.D. remain as a single organization?

A The S.D. remained independent within the office of the chief of the Security Police and the various commanders of

H0928-0004

Security Police detachments.

Q Do you know what is meant under "Personal Union"?

A Yes, I understand from that, the composition of various officers under one leader, under one chief.

Q And isn't it also one of the other facts that various units had to remain independent with the exception that they had one and the same chief?

A Yes, that I understand.

Q Therefore, between the Security Police, the S.D., was there such a personal union?

A Yes, it was an office --

Q I don't care for the other; the answer is yes or no.

THE INTERPRETER: Shall I give the whole answer?

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: I don't think the record is quite clear, as it is now.

M. HENRI MONNERAY: I ask that the witness not read from the paper. He is giving testimony from notes. He has been long enough in France to know his own organization.

BY CAPTAIN TUBRIDY:

Q Will you dispense with your notes and answer without them?

A They are just a few notes, not any answers, and up to now I did not use any of them.

Q Well, could you please answer without using them?

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q How many S.D. officers were there in France?

A There were as many S.D. officers as there were commanders.

H0928-0005

Q Did the members of the S.D. in France ~~xx~~ wear a uniform?

A Yes.

Q What uniform?

A The ~~SS~~ S.S. ~~x~~ uniform with the S.D. insignia.

Q Were these uniforms only worn by the S.D. or also by members of ~~xxxxx~~ other organizations?

A No, the S.D. insignia was also worn by --

Qq Answer my question yes or no --

COLONEL SMITH W. BROOKHART, JR.: The question is, "Did only S.D. members wear the uniform?" May I suggest that this form of question ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ may be permitted on cross-examination, there is no rule that would permit Counsel to circumscribe the witness's testimony on direct? May we have full answers?

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We would like to have the information coming from the witness. ~~Xxx x~~ Will you please phrase your questions so that the information will come from the witness and not phrase them in such a way that you inform the witness as to what you would like to have him answer.

H0928-0006

Q I suppose that in the English-American procedure you are supposed to answer "yes" or "no".

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: On his direct examination, please have him phrase ~~his~~ your question so that the information comes from the witness and not from ~~the council.~~ counsel

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I therefore ask were the uniforms only worn by the SD or other persons?

A Other persons also wore these uniforms.

Q Did people who did not belong to the party or other organizations wear the uniforms?

A Yes.

Q What other persons wore the uniform with the SD insignia?

A All that belonged to the office of the Security Police and the SD.

Q Can you tell me the number of persons that were employed by the Chief of the Security Police and the SD in all France?

A There were in all of France about 2,500.

Q How many of them were members of Amt. 3 of the Reich Security Office?

A From ten to twelve persons.

Q How many of them were members of Amt. 6, the foreign information or intelligence unit.

A About 30 to 35 people.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You mean of the 2,500?

DR. GAWLIK: Yes.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q In other words, even though only 60 to 65 people belonged to the SD offices of Amt. 3 and 6, between 2,400 and 2,500 persons wore the uniform of

H0928 - 0007

the SD in France. Is there an explanation for this?

A Yes.

Q What explanation?

A With the introduction of a higher SS and Police leader the members of the Secret Field Police and the military personnel that worked with these police were taken over by the higher SS and Police leader. All these people, according to an order, had to wear the SS uniform with the SD insignia thereon. These people were no longer members of the army and were takeh over by the Security Police. The moment they left the army, they were declared essential for the Security Police and were taken over completely by the SD, meaning that they were under the jurisdiction of the SS Police.

Q Did this lead to the fact that sometimes people who had nothing to do with the office were considered members of the SD?

A Yes.

Q Can this be said to be true of members of the Gestapo and the Criminal Police.

A Yes for both of these.

Q Did French citizens say themselves were members of the SD?

A Yes, such cases are known.

MR. MONNERAY: I am sorry to interrupt. I believe we are only interested in the SD. I think the question whether or not French citizens were a member of this association is irrelevant.

DR. GAWLIK: Far be it from me to reproach French citizens with being members of the SD. My only purpose in putting the question was not to point out that French citizens were members of the SD. Dr. Merkel just told me that the Tribunal has admitted this question.

H0928-0008

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: I understand your point. Are you trying to prove that French citizens were members of the SD or said they were members of the SD?

DR. GAWLIK: Just if they said they were members of the SD and I state this reason, they carried out illegal activities which the SD is now accused of carrying on.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You will have to direct the question to specific facts and incidents if that is what you are trying to point out.

DR. GAWLIK: I was just going to ask that question. My next question is can you give me any example.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Also the number of these incidents.

DR. GAWLIK: Yes, the witness will be able to state that.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q My first question is, did French citizens style themselves to be members of the SD in order to accomplish illegal aims and my next question is can you give examples.

A Yes, such incidents have become known first from the investigation of the Criminal Police where Frenchmen tried to carry out confiscations and secondly, there were also political incidents.

MR. MONNERAY: The witness is only dealing with individual cases, which are not it seems to me in any way connected with the general aims of the SD.

DR. GAWLIK: A bundle of document files have been submitted in which it states that the SD has committed such and such an offense.

MR. MONNERAY: The documents presented by the prosecution in this connection are official German documents which give the names of official German SD

H0928-0009

officers, therefore, the defense council does not meet the objection I brought before the commission. The question is whether or not individual French citizens pretended to be members of the SD, a question which does not deal with the aims and general purpose of the SD.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: What the defense council is trying to prove is the fact that crimes charged against the SD were not committed by the SD, but by persons who said they were members of the SD. It would appear to be to be a proper defense if it could be established. Mr. Monneray, in this case the defense council could use documents presented by the prosecution in which the SD was not involved, but French citizens pretending to be members of the SD.

DR. GAWLIK: These are just preliminary questions. I will then turn to my documents and also refer to the text in which it states the SD is alleged to have committed such and such a crime.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Council may proceed.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Can you give a closer description of individual incidents that you remember?

A For example, I can cite an incident where French Police reported to the Security Police and the SD and brought along a Frenchman who said he was a member of the SD. This man had seized 200,000 francs from French people.

Q What was not true?

A It was not true that this Frenchman had any relationship whatsoever to the SD.

Q About when did this happen?

A In the year 1943.

H0928-0010

Q Where did this happen?

A In the area or perhaps in the city of Paadict or in that area, as the commandant reported to me.

Q Do you know of any other cases?

A I can give the best example by telling you that the office of the Commandant in Paris had such a great number of these cases to deal with that a department for these cases was established to handle the people who alleged to be members of the SD and Gestapo and gave faulse statements as to their identy.

Q Can you express in numbers how many of these cases were handled during one month?

A No, I cannot answer that question. This matter was the concern of the Paris city commandant.

Q My line of evidence now turns to the accusation that members of the SD in France took part in a number of conspiracies referring to Letter C of the Triumvirate, beginning with page 17 of the German version. What were the aims and objectives of the SD Office 3 in France?

A Department 3 received its directives from Office 3 of the Reichs Main Secubity office. This was true of France too because there was a personnel shortage and nat all matters of Amt. 3 could be handled there, therefor the main task or the main work done their concerned itself with reports on the effect of German measures on the German population. Economic questions played a large part in this. For example, food rationing cards had been introduced. The chapter concerning the black market was an important one in the economic sector. A number of special envoys of Germany were employed, whose work very often covered the same work that had to be carried out by

H0928-0011

the administrative offices of the Economic Department in France. The main point of this was bringing about an improvement of the state of affairs existing. Labor employment also played a very important part. It would appear that such measures would have a tremendous effect on the French population and their feelings and opinions.

Q What reports did the SD hand into Amt. 3 in Berlin concerning the black market and labor employment?

A There were many conflicts. The black market was to be suppressed, however if German Officers had bought on the black market and then were expected to fight the black market. The same is true in the administrative sector and the propaganda sector where there were absolute contradictions where German offices were established and these offices worked according to various directives which had to be given by the German Police Office or by means of the German embassy or the propaganda unit, together with its military commandant.

Q What were the aims and objectives of the SD Amt. 6 in France?

A Department 6 also received its orders from Amt. 6 of the Reichs Main Security Office. The main task of this department was reports on French political organizations and diverse political organizations and diverse French parties and directives. Another was the building up of an intelligence service in France, which was above all to try to get news from outside of France and to use France as a depository for such news and information.

Q While you worked in France did you know that Hitler, together with other persons, were members of a secret group or agreement to commit crimes against peace, war or humanity and to persecute Jews and Churches?

H0928-0012

A No.

Q Do you know if other members of the SD employed in France knew of this?

A They probably knew as little as I.

Q Did you gather this from conversations you had with SD members?

A Yes.

Q Could you answer the question as to whether members of the SD employed in France took part in any such a plan?

A I do not know that any member took part in any such a plan.

Q Do you consider it impossible?

A Yes.

Q Did a member of the SD employed in France know that the war that German was waging was an aggressive war.

A No.

Q Did they know that all measures which had been taken by the party leadership and state leadership were in contradiction to the international law?

A No.

Q Were the activities of the SD known to the French Government at that time.

A Yes.

Q Had Petain given his agreement to the SD activities that is concerning the handling of intelligence and information matters.

A Yes.

Q Were the members of the SD employed in France convinced that Petain's government was a legal government as far as international law is concerned.

H0928 - 0013

A Yes

Q Did the members of the SD employed in France have any influence on the selection of the leaders of the party and its formations in France?

A No, the SD had only/given general reports on these parties and had no influence on the regulations and directives of such parties.

Q If I understood you correctly, the SD gave only purely objective reports on party conditions in France?

A Yes.

Q Did the SD in France carry on any espionage or spying activities?

A I imagine you and I understand the same thing as to the word "Spitzel". I understand that a "Spitzel" is a man who for money or other renumeration gives out information on foreign affairs.

Q As I understand the term "Spitzel", it is a man whose main work is to hand over people to the authorities. Was this the work of the SD in France?

A No.

Q Did the SD in France check on the trust worthiness and reliability of the Germans employed in France?

A No.

Q Did elections take place in France?

A No - not that I remember.

Q I shall turn to War Crimes of which the SD has been accused in France. Rule 6 of the Triumvirate. I now turn to Letter B from Page 39 on of the German Version 6-B. My evidence is onlygoing to confine itself to France. Were their prisoner of war camps in France?

A Yes.

Q Under whose administration and guard were these camps in France?

H0928-0014

A All such camps in France were solely under the jurisdiction of the Military Commander.

Q Was the SD ever called upon to direct, manage or guard any personnel of war camps in France.

A No, never.

Q Did the SD in France have any special units or formations in order to select people who were undesirable for political or racial reasons and to execute them?

A No.

Q I now refer to Letter C of the Triumvirate, page 42 of the German version. Do you know of the decree bulletin of March 4, 1944?

A No.

Q I should like to submit Document PS 1650 USA 246. Who had to do with the carrying out of this decree in France, the Security Police or the SD?

A Neither the Secucity Police or the SD.

Q Then you can answer my next question. Did putting this order into effect belong to the work of the activities of the SD in France.

A No.

Q Can you give any definite reason for this statement? Look at the reference number.

A This decree was issued by Amt. 4.

Q Could you explain what Amt. 4 means?

A Amt. 4 is the executive office of the Gestapo.

H0928 - 0015

Q Did the SD in France have any executive power at all?

A No.

Q Was the SD employed in order to carry out this decree?

A No.

Q Did the members of the SD know of the existance of the decree bulletin at all?

A No.

Q Can you give any definite reason for this.

A This decree was never sent to France.

Q I now turn to Letter D of the Triumvirate. Were there concentration camps in France?

A Yes, there were French concentration camps in France.

Q In order to clarify the matter, who directed these camps?

A These concentration camps were directed by the French Government as fas as I know before the year 1940.

Q Who managed and supervised these camps?

A The French Government and its executive offices alone.

Q Who was responsible for sending people into the concentration camps?

A The French Police.

Q Did the SD have anything to do with sending people into these camps or directing these camps, such as guarding or supervising them.

A No.

Q Did the SD ever carry on tortures in the concentration camps?

A No, the SD personnel never did interfere in these camps.

Q In order to clarify, did the SD carry on any executions in the

H0928-0016

concentration camps.

A No.

Q What other kinds of camps were there in France?

A There were the so-called Police Detention Camps, which were directed by the German authorities.

Q Who managed these Police Detention Camps?

A The Military Commandant and his Military administration.

Q From which organization were the guards taken for these camps?

A The guards were German soldiers and they were placed at the disposal of the camps by the German Military authorities.

Q Did the SD have anything to do with these Police Detention Camps?

A No.

Q Did any change as to this take place after the institution of the higher SS and Police Fuehrer?

A No.

Q Were there internment camps.

A Yes.

Q Who was placed in internment camps?

A Citizens of those countries with which Germany was at war.

Q Who managed these Internment camps?

A The military commandant and the military administration.

Q Which organization gave the guards for these camps?

A The Wehrmacht and at the order of the Military Commandant.

Q Did the SD carry on any work or have any part at all in these Internment camps.

A No, not that I know of.

H0928-0017

Q Did the SD manage any other prisoner camps.

A No.

Q Were there labor training camps?

A No, not in France.

Q Did the SD have prisons in France?

A No.

Q Who instituted the Wehrmacht Detention Institution?

A Also the military commandant

Q Did the SD have anything to do with this?

A No.

Q I now refer to Letter E of the Triumvirate. Was it one of the tasks of the SD in France to have a hand in the deporting of French citizens for labor purposes into Germany?

A No.

Q Was the SD ever employed for this?

A No.

Q Would such tasks be within the scope of the activities of the SD in France?

A No.

Q Who was responsible for these measures?

A The military government. There was a special office within the ministry government called the office for Labor Enforcement.

Q I now refer to Letter F of the Triumvirate, page 47. I should like to submit the Commando order of October 14, 1942, Dec. Ps 498, U. S. Version 501. Did the execution of this commando order belong to the tasks of the SD in France.

A No.

Q Was the SD employed to arrest any of the allies who had taken part in

H0928-0018

the so-called commando activities?

A No, I don't remember of any case.

Q I refer you to No. 4 of the Order where it says: "If individual members of such commandoes fall into the hands of the Wehrmacht in any other way, they are to be handed over to the SD immediately." Your testimony is in contradiction to these statements in this decree. What can you say in reply?

A Putting this order into effect, carrying out this order would have meant an Executive action, but the SD never carried on any executive work, that was the work of the Security Police Department 4.

Q Yes, but what is your explanation for the term SD in the Commando order?

A I knew that the practise was very wide spread which mistakenly used the initials SD when it really meant Gestapo and Security Police.

Q Will you please look at the signature? Who signed this Commando Order?

A Hitler, personally.

Q Do you believe that even Hitler could have made this mistake?

A Yes.

Q Can you give any more definite reasons? Did this mistake of the term take place even in the highest office?

A Yes. I know that the same mistakes were made by the Commanders in Chief and by the Military Commandant.

Q You mean to say that the carrying out of this Commando order is merely an executive matter. Only the Gestapo and the Criminal Police had such executive power and the SD as an intelligence service had no such executive power and therefore could not carry out this order. Is that true?

A Yes.

H0928-0019

Q Will you look at the distribution? Does the distribution clear up anything as to whether the Security Police or the Security Service were to carry out this order.

A It says here that the letter was directed by the distribution to the Main Office of the Security Police.

Q What offices would have to be mentioned in the distribution?

A I don't know if a specification order distribution would have been made as to Amt. 3, 4 or 6 in this order, but if it were issued by the Reichs Main Security Office it would have to be directed to Amt. 3 or 6, but I don't know if any orders which were to be carried out by executive power were ever directed to Amt. 3 and 6.

Q I should now like to submit a command of the High Command of the Army, dated August 2, 1942, P.S. 553, U. S. Version 500. Will you please read this order through and then tell me if carrying out this order belonged to the work of the SD in France?

A It was not the work of the SD to carry out the execution of this order.

Q Was the SD in France ever used to put this order into effect?

A No.

Q Can you clarify your opinion?

A The questions dealing with sabotage or counter or defense sabotage were treated by Amt. 4.

Q Perhaps you better tell us what Amt. 4 was?

A Amt. 4 was the department that had to deal with the matter concerned with Amt. 4 of the Reichs Main Security Office.

Q I should now like to submit to you a letter of April 5, 1944, PS 385, U. S. 806. Was the carrying out of this order the work of the SD?

H0928 - 0020

A No.

Q Was the SD used to carry out this order?

A No.

Q Is this already evidenced by looking at the reference numbers.

A Yes under Letter 6 it says that the Chief of Amt. 3 and 6 were being handed this order for their information only. It would have said so if carrying out this order had been one of the tasks of the SD. Amt. 3 and 6 would have had to be mentioned in Paragraph 5 and specific reference would have been made to the fact that they were to cooperate with the other offices.

Q I don't believe you answered my question if this was proven by the reference number.

A Yes, it is also evidenced from the reference number from the issuing office of Amt. 4.

Q If it had belonged to the work of the SD, your reference file number would have had to be given there?

A Yes, the reference number of a department of Amt. 3.

Q Instead of Roman numeral 4, it would have read Roman numeral 3.

A Yes.

Q I now refer to a letter of June 23, 1944 dealing with the treatment of commando members with reference to the commando order of October 18, 1942. It is a teletype issued by the Commander in Chief West. It is Document 531 PS-U.S. 550. Will you please look at the second last paragraph and note that it says that the cases of living members of the commandoes that have fallen into our hands, are to be turned over to the SD. What do you say to that?

A Here the SD has been confused with the Gestapo and the Security Police.

H0928-0021

Com.
Take 2-Pg. 16.
Meehan
31 May.

Q I should now like to refer to Doc. 532 PS, RF 368 and 551 PS also US 551. This is the reply to the document that I have just submitted, Documents 531 and 532 PS. This order was not approved by Hitler as stated by Biddle in the testimony of April 4, 1946 in the German minutes of the Session, page 7188 and 7189. For this reason, the version of the order became Document 551. In this Document it says that members of allied or enemy forces that fall into our hands alive are to be handed over to the SD. What can you say in reply here?

A Here too the SD cannot have been meant, but the Security Police.

Q I should now like to submit to you a latter order of the Security Police and SD of January 5, 1945 - 535 PS, U.S. 807. Please look at the date and tell me if this decree was carried out in France at all.

A The order was issued a long time after I had been in France. I was recalled from France in August of 1944.

Q State very briefly conditions in France after the allied landing and state whether the SD carried out any activities after this date.

A After the invasion - I might even say weeks before the invasion - the entire command of authority was transferred to the military offices. Orders issued by the Commander in Chief West and the Military Commandant said that military offices were to be selected of which the military battle commandants were to be in charge. The work of the SD, as such, could no longer be carried out expecially concerning reports to the officers as the communications to these offices had been interrupted. This was reporting solely for the information of the field commandants or by the chief of Amt. 3 for the Military Commandant in France.

Q Could one say that the SD stocked its activities upon the landing of

H0928-0022

the allies in France.

A Yes, one might say so for there were no further directives issued by Amt. 3.

~~RECESS AT 1300 HOURS.~~
(The Commission adjourned until 1400 hours)

****

H0928-0023

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 19461

31 MAY 1946

COMMISSIONERS:

Captain Joseph Tubridy
Mr. Rasumov

(The Commission convened at 1400 hours.)

COL. NEAVE: Dr. Gawlik, before you begin your examination of the witness, I have a number of announcements to make. The Tribunal has instructed me to read the following order, which will be posted on the bulletin board in the Defense Information Center.

"First, the hearing of witnesses for organizations before the Commission will cease on Friday, July 5. Second, the Commissioners will endeavor to hear as many witnesses as possible for each organization within that period. Thirdly, applications for witnesses to be heard in Court should be made to the General Secretary as soon as the witness has been heard on Commission."

That notice will be published in the Defense Information Center by Lt. Cmdr. Scheurer. The second notice , to which I wish to direct your attention, is also going to be put on the notice board in the Defense Information Center.

It refers to witnesses or rather, prospective witnesses who have not yet arrived in Nurnberg, and it asks defense counsel to cooperate in sending in lists of the mosts important witnesses, so that the military authorities

H0928-0024

can give special priority to their being brought to Nurnberg.

The third thing is that the Tribunal ruled yesterday that the principle that all witnesses will be heard on Commission whether or not they are subsequently heard in Court, will be upheld, and that the application of Dr. Laternser in that respect is denied.

Finally, will defense counsel please comply with the request which was mentioned last night by Capt. Tubridy, and which should be published on the ~~next~~ board in the Defense Information Center, that they should submit to the Commissioner a short, written statement of the matters that they wish to prove. If possible, and if there is time to do it, we shall be glad to have this translated into English beforehand, and if ~~not~~ Defense Counsel have any difficulty about getting that done, I shall be glad to help. Would all Defense Counsel, therefore, please comply with that request?

There will be a meeting of Defense Counsel in my room at 10:00 o'clock tomorrow, Saturday morning.

THE SD

HELMUT KNOCHEN, (Continued) ~~a witness, took the~~ stand and ~~testified as follows:~~
Direct examination - (Resumed).

CAPT. TUBRIDY: We will proceed with the examination.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I am now coming to single phases of the Commando order. I present to you document C-176, GW0228. It concerns two marine soldiers that were found ~~drifting~~ drifting toward land in a rubber life raft. First, look at the photostatic ~~copy~~ copy.

(Witness is handed document C-176.)

H0928 - 0025

On page 710 it states, "C Commander Gascogne reports the handing over of the two men with their material that was found with them at 4:15 to S. D. Bordeaux."

What did S. D. Bordeaux have to do in this case?

A S. D. Bordeaux had nothing to do with this. The real order read "Gestapo Bandits".

Q It also says here, concerning the call of the personal referendum to the Chief of the SD in Paris, "SS Obersturmfuehrer Dr. Schmitz." Who was Dr. Schmitz?

A Dr. Schmitz was the personal reference to the Chief of the Security Police and the SD.

Q Is the title, Commissioner or Chief of the SD in Paris correct?

A No.

Q What should have been the correct name?

A The Commissioner or Chief of the Security Police and the SD.

Q Therefore, was the SD, that is, AMT III or AMT IV, the organization or the group to take care of this?

A No, it only could have been AMT IV.

Q On the same page it continues.

"After conversations with the Chief of the Leadership staff, the SD is advised to get the permission from the headquarters director."

Is the word SD correct here?

A No.

Q How should it read.

A Office of the Security Police and SD Bordeaux.

Q On the end of the document, it says that the two British ~~parachubers~~ prisoners

H0928 - 0026

were shot by a group from the Harbor ~~Commissioner~~ Commissioner Boards, a group with the strength of 60 men, together with one officer of the SD, on order of the Fuehrer.

COL. GRIFFITH JONES: I wonder if Dr. Gawlik would tell me which ~~a~~ document book this was presented in. In what stage of the Prosecution's documents was this presented?

CAPT. TUBRIDY: Dr. Gawlik, would you give us the docum ent reference of that document?

COL. GRIFFITH JONES: I have got the number of it, I would like to know in what Prosecution Document book it was put in, or what particular presentation.

DR. GAWLIK: I will check that.

COL. GRIFFITH JONES: Perhpas Dr. Gawlik will let me know later.

DR. GAWLIK: Yes. I think it was presented in court during the meeting in court, and I will see if I can give you the number of the periodical.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q What do you have to say to this?

A What was the last question.

Q Concerning the officer of the SD that was taking part.

A He probably was not a member of AMT III, but a member of AMT IV that handed back these prisoners to the Navy after their questioning.

Q Maybe you can give a more specific reason why it probably was not a member of AMT III, but a member of AMT IV?

A In this phase, it is concerning defensive questioning, and especially when it concerned matters of defense the SD did not do any questioning whatsoever.

H0928 - 0027

Q Was it ~~xxx~~ part of the duties of the SD in France to take part in executions?

A No.

Q I now present to you a document, F-1244, same as RF-1244. It is concerning a refusal for clemency by the high court, the highest military court with the Army in France on the 6th of August 1942. Read the document.

(Document presented to witness, who reads same.)

Were those three French citizens sentenced by a court of the SD?

A No.

Q Maybe you can give me a more specific reason for that?

A It is clear, from the document, that it is a sentence of a court martial of the military commissioners of France. Once in Evreux, and once in Epinal.

Q Were there any SD courts in France?

A No.

Q Did the SD have anything to do with the execution of witnesses?

A No.

Q Therefore, ~~xxxx

H0928 - 0028

of appeal court for the SD at times.

I ask you now, did the SD have anything to do with the sentencing and with the execution of the sentence? Who sentenced these three citizens?

A The military courts.

Q Who refused a clemency appeal?

A General Field Marshall Keitel.

Q And who executed the sentences?

A These three men that were sentenced to death were executed in connection with the reprisal of the higher SS and police leaders. Otherwise, all three of them would have been shot by the military court, and its executive command. In other words, they were shot together, or with those that were sentenced to death in connection with the reprisal measurements.

Q I therefore ask you now, were they shot by members of the SD or members of the other organization?

A They were not shot by the SD.

Q I now come to the document PS-1276, US-520. It is a letter from the Chief of the Security Police and the SD, dated 17 June 1944, and it concerns the arrest of various parachuters of French nationality in British uniforms. In the document, it is stated that these members of the commando groups were handed over to the Security Police. On the original document, there is a note which reads:

"They were arrested by the SD."

This remark is from a German office. I now ask you, if it says on the original document that these members of the commando troops were handed over to the Security Police, would it necessarily mean that they were arrested by the SD?

H0928 - 0029

A No, the remark is wrong.

(Document is shown to witness.)

LT. WHITNEY HARRIS: I think it is proper that the documents be shown to the Tribunal in order that the relation of these entries ~~xxxx~~ be noted. The two entries that defense counsel has reference to are in widely ~~xxxxxxx~~ separated paragraphs, and I think that the witness should see the document so that ~~xx~~ he is aware of that fact.

CAPT. TUBRIDY: Lt. Harris, do you have reference to this particular document?

LT. WHITNEY HARRIS: Yes, this particular document that he is referring to right now.

CAPT. TUBRIDY: May I have your objection again, Lt. Harris?

LT. WHITNEY HARRIS: Counsel has stated, he has put a ~~xxxxxxx~~ hypothetical question to the witness in asking him if the document states that these parachuters were to be turned over to the Security Police. Then the notation opposite that entry, that the arrests were made by the SD, is presumably erroneous, whereas in fact, upon the document, that notation is made opposite an entry which refers to the Security Police and the SD, in paragraph 1 of the document. In other words, I do not think that Counsel has accurately described this document in his question to the witness.

DR. GAWLIK: It says here, before the last paragraph:

"I consider it essential that the necessary orders should ~~xx~~ also be given from there in order that the individual unit of the armed forces may not, ~~x~~ as has often been the case, interpret them wrongly and turn the commando troops over to the Security Police instead of slaughtering them in combat or if they retreat."

H0928 - 0030

In this sentence I also want to point out that the Security police is mentioned, and not the SD. In other words, they were to be handed over to the Security Police and there is no mention of the SD at all.

LT. WHITNEY HARRIS: If the Court please, my whole point is that this paragraph refers to the handing over to the Security Police by the Army. It does not refer to the original arrest. Presumably, arrests could have been made by the SD and Security Police on its own, in cases where these arrests were handed over by the Army. I do not see any importance in this entry on the end of the line opposite this paragraph to which the counsel has reference. It is the first paragraph which indicates that presumably members of the SD did make arrests, presumably, since it was written, as counsel says, by a member of the SD charged with carrying out this type of order.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Then I ask the witness, did the SD have any orders to arrest people?

A No.

CAPT. TUBRIDY: Just a minute. Do you concede that the prior question should be stricken out, Dr. Gawlik?

DR. GAWLIK: No, why should it be stricken out?

CAPT. TUBRIDY: Because Lt. Harris has a point in what he says.

DR. GAWLIK: I think that there is a misunderstanding here, and I want to clear up with further questions that the SD did not have anything to do with arresting people.

CAPT. TUBRIDY: Yes, but you are trying to use an incorrect entry to do that, and the document is more or less self-explanatory, and by questioning the witness in ~~that~~ the manner that you are, a different meaning is given than would be by reading the document itself. If you want to question the witness

H0928-0031

as to whether the document states what was a common practice, then you may do so.

DR. GAWLIK: But Mr. Commissioner, I can also ask the witness concerning the remarks on the edge of the letter. The witness is the sole person who can testify because he was the Commissioner of theSecurity Police and SD in France, the person mentioned in this letter. The document contains a mistake with this remark. I do not know whether that is clear. The original could prove that this is a mistake.

CAPT. TUBRIDY: Are you attempting to prove that this is a mistake?

DR. GAWLIK: Yes, that is the point of the questioning.

CAPT. TUBRIDY: Very well.

WITNESS: May I ask a question concerning this?

DR. GAWLIK: You may state what you want to say , but you cannot ask a question.

WITNESS: I notice, after this remark,a question mark, and I am wondering whether the reader was not wondering whether this arrest was made by the Security Police or by the military.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I ask you, regarding this quotation, "Therefore arrested by SD", is the remark right or wrong?

A The remark is basically wrong, because this was not the duty of the SD.

Q Read the document and tell me.

(Witness reads document.)

A Yes.

Q Who did the arresting, the Security Police or the SD?

H0928 - 0032

A I suppose from this letter that it was neither the Security Police or the SD.

Q If somebody did arrest these people, who could it have been, the SD or the Security Police?

A Then the Security Police.

Q How do you explain this incorrect remark?

A That is probably because the name SD was usually used also to designate Security Police.

Q I now come to the document F-257, equl to RF-405. It is the Field Day book of the Field Command 588, concerning Staff 588.

COL. GRIFFITH JONES: May I have the original?

H0928 - 0033

By DR. GAULICK:

Q Look at page 2 on top. There it says:

"In the area of Issoir, where with a group one officer, nine policemen with the SD, three terrorists were arrested." It continues: "In the town of Cantal it occurred near Mammal, a larger unit of 16 field policemen with the SD and air force - during this action four terrorists were shot and arrested." What does "SD" mean in this case?

A "SD" here again means security police.

Q Did the SD have anything at all to do with this?

A No

Q Look now on page 2 at the bottom, there it says: "One officer, 14 field policemen of the SD were grouped against the terrorists, one terrorist is being shot and thirty six persons arrested. What does "SD" mean in this case?

A "SD" again points to the security police.

Q Did the SD have anything to do with that?

A Nothing whatsoever.

Q In order to save time, I don't want to talk about the individual cases in this day book in which the SD is being mentioned. Will you look on page 4, page 8, page 79, page 81? In all of these cases who is meant by the "SD"?

H0928 - 0034

A In all of these cases the group which this means is Amt four of the Security Police.

Q In all of these cases did the SD have anything to do with it?

A No.

Q I just want to mention the remark on page 58 especially. This remark is concerning a case sent in by the Prefect of Lecturn? as to whether wounded prisoners could be brought in ~~xxx~~ as prisoners of war. The Headquarters or Head Command decided that these wounded are to be treated like bandits or partisans and to be turned over to the obwehr of the SD. Who is meant by the SD in this case?

A Once again in this case that ~~xxxx~~ Amt four refers to the military abwehr.

Q Did the SD interior or foreign information group or intelligence groups have anything to do with this case?

A No.

Q Could the officers of the foreign or interior intelligence group, could they have done anything with these wounded?

A No, they were not informed at all concerning the question of terrorists and what is to be done with them.

H0928-0035

Q Do you have anything at all to say in regard to this remark?

A I only want to state that the fighting of terrorists was also a job of the military abwehr or defense and from what I have seen in this war log book I have noticed that the general diagram for corresponding area commanders are at command posts in each of these cases. The security police and military abwehr were doing their duty here in order to strengthen group 1, I believe.

Q I now present you document 547 equal to RF 393 in the French language. Will you look at the second page? There it is regarding the SD is mentioned, and tell me whether once again it was a mistake with the SD and that actually the security police is meant?

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Does the Prosecution have the document?

DR. GAULICK: ~~YXXX~~ No.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Would you like to look at thos document?

M. MONNERAY: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You may proceed.

BY DR. GAULICK:

Q I asked the question whether or not here once again there has been a mistake in identity, that is, whether once again the security police is meant by SD?

H0928-0036

A Yes, once again there is a mkx mis-statement in the translation.

Q I now present to you Our Document 110, U SA 333, it is concerning an order according to which persons that had lynched allied fliers are to be protected. Was this an order of Himmler in regard to the French?

A No.

Q For what reason?

A There were not enough Germans in France to make this order worthwhile, and for the French population that order was not of any importance.

Q I now come to Figure "G" of the Trial Brief on page 48 of the German. It is called "Nacht und Nabel". I present to you this document L-90, USA 503, that is the XNACHXXXXX "Nacht und Nxx Nabel" order of the 12 December, 1941, together with the directions of use, or how that is supposed to be carried out, from the 2 February, 1942, from the High Command of the Army and called a directive of xx 2 February, 1942, as to how it is to be carried out. Was the SD used in France to carry out these orders and these directives?

A No.

Q I now put before you the order of the Chief of the Security Police of the SD of the 24 June, 1942. It is the document PS 668, USA 504. Was the SD used in the execution of the measures that are contained

H0928-0037

in this order?

A No.

Q I present you four more orders concerning this "Nacht und Nabel" order. It is a secret order from Hitler of the 30 July 1944 from the High Command of the Army of the 2nd of September, 1944, the 18th of August, 1944, or from the 8, 18th, 1944. They are documents 762, GB 298, PS 835, USA 528, 763 GB 300 and D764, GB 299. Please read through these documents and tell me whether these orders were carried out in France and if they were carried out, whether they were carried out by the SD?

A I do not know anything concerning the execution of these orders. I do not know also whether my successor received these orders. If these orders went to the higher SS and police leaders and Chief of the Security Police, then it was not the duty of the SD to carry out these orders. Whether or not the SD was yet in France after August, 1944, or whether it had been pulled out by that time, I do not know. I only know that the Chief up to then of Amt 3, I know that he was pulled out of France at the same time, and I don't know whether a successor had been named for him.

Q When was the leader of group 3 recalled?

H0928 - 0038

A Also around the 20th of August.

Q Now, please look at the document D-762, that is No. 2. To whom where the terrorists and saboteurs to be handed over?

A The nearest local office of the security police and the SD

Q And who were these officers who were in charge of the security police of SD.

A Group 4, because it's duties were concerning terror activities and sabotage activities.

Q Now look at the Document D-763. There it says they are to be handed over to the SD.

A In this case only it can be once again the so often mentioned error, that because of the shortness of "SD", there is a mistake and it was supposed to mean security police and SD offices.

Q Now, look at Document D-764. What does it mean concerning the handing over to the SD for work use?

A It could be that these persons were supposed to be handed over to work camps of the State Police or that they came into the scope of the work of the organization Sonderkommando? I ought to say this order, it would not have been possible to effect this order in France, since in France there were no German work education camps and that the security police did not work

H0928 - 0039

together with the organization Sonderkommando? on this work.

Q If you say the SD had nothing to do with it, how do you explain the sentence: "To the SD for work use?"

A I declare that it was once again the same before mentioned error, and in this document it is wrong, in ~~ex~~ 5-A. It is ~~xxxxxxx~~ correct in No. 4, as it should have been it is in No. 4, but in 5-A it is incorrect.

Q Did the SD work together with the German work organization or the French organizations that were to provide persons for this work organization?

A The SD had nothing to do with the carrying out of such orders. He did, however, report concerning the orders and the feeling of the French population concerning these orders?

(A recess was taken)

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We may as well proceed.

BY DR. GAULICK:

Q You testified that the SD only reported on labor and finances, were these reports purely objective ones?

A Yes, they were reports of sentiment and opinion, and at the same time, the number of manpower which had been requested and recruited was included.

H0928-0040

Q These reports were then objective reports on public feeling and opinions concerning the measures taken on labor employees, that is correct?

A Yes, they reported on information and intelligence reports which had been received concerning measures taken by French and German authorities.

Q I should now like to submit to you an order by the Army High Command on 4 September, 1944, concerning the "Nacht und Nebel" decree, as No. D-766, GB 301. Will you please look at it and tell me whether this decree became in France -

M. MONNERAY: I object. I think if the witness wasn't in France he could not testify.

DR. GAULICK: Then my question will run as follows:

Q Witness, do you know whether any German officers at all were still doing duty in France in September of the year 1944?

A Yes.

Q Can you answer the question as to whether this decree was put into effect in September, 1944?

A No, I cannot.

Q Summarizing, do you want to say, if in these documents we find repeated notes concerning the handing over of persons to the SD in France, would you say that these notes were misleading?

H0928 -0041

A Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Was he working in France in the years ~~up~~ subsequent to 1942?

DR. GAULICK: ~~No~~, until 1944.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: ~~All right~~. Will you limit ~~your~~ your questions and the witness' testimony ~~up~~ to the period of time when he was in France?

DR. GAULICK: The witness was in France until a short time before the Allied Occupation of France.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Well, my point is this: Dr. Gaulick, will you repeat your last question?

BY DR. GAULICK:

Q Is the remark "handing over of persons to the SD in France" a remark which we find on numerous documents, a misleading one?

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You mean documents submitted to him or in all documents?

DR. GAULICK: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: And in the documents which have been submitted to him?

DR. GAULICK: Yes.

BY DR. GAULICK:

Q What is the meaning of "handing over to the SD"?

A This means handing over to the executive department of department 4 of the security police.

H0928 - 0042

Q Is it, therefore, correct to say, as the Prosecution has maintained, I refer to one document of the minutes of the meeting of 6 April, 1946, document, ~~PS-6~~ P7290, handing over to the SD means "handing people over to be sent in to concentration camps and executed?" The question refers to France and to the time in which you were in France?

A No, it is not correct.

H0928 -0043

Q Can you give any reason for your answer?

A My reason for the answer is that SD work was carried out by Amt III and Amt VI. This work was taken care of by station area offices in France, and these departments never had any executive powers.

Q I now read to you letter"K"of the trial brief, page 51, whereas this concerns the seizure. Who confiscated the religious,scientific, and art archives in France?

A Every confiscation was carried through by the military government.

Q Did the SD have any power of seizure in France?

A No.

Q Did the SD have a hand in the seizures?

A No, not that I know of.

Q I now refer to third degree hearing letter "L" of the trial brief Did the SD in France carry on any hearings or examinations?

A No.

Q Did the SD in France have theright to carry on hearings and examinations?

A No,the SD did not have this right.

Q Did the SD carry out the third degree interrogations?

A No.

Q Did the SD in France hand over people for examination and interrogations to any other office of a military or police character?

A No.

Q I nowturn to crimes against humanity. Concerning the persucution of Jews in France. What measures were taken against the Jews in France?

A Laws were issued in France by the German authorities of the offices of the military commander, as well as the French laws of the

H0928 - 0044

French authorities concerning Jews.

Q Who caused the Jews to be deported from France?

A These deportationswere carried out at Himmler's initiative, who had given corresponding directives to military government,and against whom the administrative orders were directed.

Q Which German office had a hand in this matter?

A This was taken in by the socalled Jewish Department of the Reich Main Security Office to a special department in charge of which was Obersturmbannfuehrer Eichmann, who had these deputies in France. It was organized as belonging to Amt IV. Eichmann's Deputy was associated with the German embassy,with the military commanders,and with the French authorities . There were divers numbers of officers and military commanders who had a hand in this.

Q Was there any connections at all between this deputy of Eichmann and the SD?

A No.

Q I should now like to submit document RF 1216 to you concerning the deportation of five-thousand Jews from France. Did the SD have any hand in this?

A No.

Q Can you give any more specific reasons for that?

A Because this Jewish question was not concerned with the SD,and consequently the SD did not have to work on these questions.

Q I should now like to submit document F 1207 -- RF 1207, a report on the Jewish question in France,and its treatment. Please turn to page 70. The photostatic is not signed. It only states Obersturmfuehrer. Can you tell us who issued this report?

H0928 - 0045

A The report must have been written by Obersturmfuehrer Dannecker in 1944.

Q Was Dannecker a member of the SD?

A I only know that he took care of all these questions at the order of Amt IV.

Q Was he Eichmann's immediate subordinate?

A Yes.

Q And received immediate instructions, or direct instructions from Eichmann in Berlin?

A Yes.

Q Please turn to page 1. On page 1 it states the title which reads as follows: "Final solution of Jewish question, and aim of the Jewish actions of the Department of the SD, and its security police in France." Considering this ~~xxxxxxxx~~ heading, my question is, did the SD have anything to do with this handling of the Jewish Question Department?

A No, as such the SD had nothing to do with this Department for Jewish questions. Of course, the Department III received orders or measures against Jews as many other offices in France also did.

Q Please turn to page 18. There it says, "The man in charge of the department for Jewish matters demanded the institution of a Jewish newspaper." According to that statement there was a man of the SD who was concerned with Jewish matters.

M. MONNERAY: What page is that?

DR. GAWLIK: 18.

THE WITNESS: I can only explain by saying that the author of this report used the term "SD" without supplementing it, or, that he used the term "SD" of his own accord.

H0928 - 0046

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I don't quite understand. My questions is, was this man who was in charge of the Jewish Question Department a member of the SD, or was he of the SD?

A I don't know whether he was a member of the SD. We only know that he worked at the orders of Amt IV,and for Amt IV.

Q If he had formerly been a member of SD,and was now working for Amt IV/of this Referat, that would mean he was no longer a member of Amt III which is identical of SD, is that true.

A Yes.

Q What explanation can you give for this expression "Juden-Referat for the SD," a man in charge of Jewish questions for the SD. Read the question through.

A I presume that this term was used by various offices, German and French offices, as meaning a representative of the Reich Main Security Office,and it is representative of the Reich Main Security ~~Office~~ Police and the SD.

Q Was this man a deputy of the chief of the Security Police and SD?

A No, this man came directly under the orders of Eichmann of Amt IV, and he operated very much with Himmler's decrees, and Himmler's orders.

Q Will you explain, why if this man came from Amt IV, he was called Juden Referent, that is of Amt III?

A The explanation for this is again,that in the course of conversations that this man may have had the military and political authorities of the same mistaken designation was given as member of the SD without making or going to the trouble of making a distinction between Departments III and VI, which was the information and intelligence department.

H0928-0047

Q Did Amt IV belong to the Security Police, would you say that is correct?

A Yes, it was the Gestapo office.

Q Have I understood you correctly. Do you mean to say that here too the term "SD" was meant to designate an office of the Security Police?

A Yes, surely.

Q Would this be true of all cases wherein this report the mention is made of the man in charge of the Jewish question?

A Yes.

Q Turn to page 27, the third line from the top it says, Obersturmfuehrer Dannacker said, That here we are only concerned with solving the question generally, and that the SD must have possibilities of executing the orders transmitted to it. These orders of the Reich Main Security Office were the final solution orders. We mean directed against the extermination of the Jews, and the SD was to carry out these orders." What can you say in reply?

A The SD had nothing to do with the question, as they held in the entire question of Jewish immigration or deportation, as this was the special task of the special Referat department. The SD had nothing to do with this here. It is a mistake, or I might perhaps say it is a negligent work where a short designation as "D" was used for "SD" and Security Police.

Q Turn to the last paragraph on page 27. There it says, "Therefore, the information given by Ministerrialrate Dr. Stortz is important with the directions--- with the work of Vallat, and future directions in this matter is to be handled by the SD." What does the "SD" mean here?

A Here it means Jewish Special Department for the SD, which as I already testified had nothing to do with this matter.

H0928 - 0048

Q Turn to page 68. Here mention is made of concentration camp actions, accroding to which the French Police took into custody the 3,000 Jews. Did the SD in France have anything to do with this measure?

A No.

Q I should like to submit to you a document No. F-1219, and also one No. F-1217. These documents concern deportation of Jews from France. Please read these documents after looking at the reference number, and tell me whether the SD in France had anything to do with these transports of Jews?

A No. The SD had nothing to do with these measures. This is evident from the reference numbers, Amt IV,and, secondly, that the head of Department III was not informed of this, and head of Department IV likewise was not informed.

Q In both the documents, Nos. 1217 and 1219, is this shown by the reference numbers?

A Reference number 4J shows that there can be no question of a SD department here.

Q What would be the reference number if the SD had had a part in these measures?

A The reference number would have been begun with the number 3.

Q I should like now to submit document F-1210 to you, entitled, "Jews" dated 22 February 1942. Under No. 1 it shows,"Task of the Security Police in France." Can you by reason of this document tell me, or give reasons whether the SD had anything to do with the Jewish measures in France?

A Yes, I can. This is again evident from the reference number 4J. Furthermore, there is a mark saying , that it is being put on file at Amt IV. It might be that this is the reference number of the Reich Security Office. Sofar as I know Jewish questions were filed under 4B,but it might have been

H0928-0049

later. At any rate, it shows that this is a matter concerned with "4" as is shown by the reference number.

Q Further on mention is made in this document of "Tuesday conferences in Paris." What was the purpose of these Tuesday conferences.

A Sofar as I know I myself never took part in any of these Tuesday conferences. The purpose was to inform all offices concerned, and to keep them informed by means of these conferences.

Q Which were?

A The work that had to be done by the German authorities in order to solve and settle the question that helped the French authorities to take care of the deportation of Jews.

Q Did the SD take part in these Tuesday conferences?

A I do not believe so.

Q Is this not shown by the document?

A In this document only the departments taking regular part in these conferences were mentioned, as the military authorities, the re-administrative offices, the German Embassy, and the actions Einsatzstab and group west Rosenberg.. There is no mention of the special representative of the SD.

Q If it had been the commission of the SD to take part in the transporting and deportation of Jews from France, would the representatives of the SD have taken part regularly in these Tuesday conferences?

A Yes.

COLONEL BROOKHART: I object and ask it be stricken. He asked if that is to be so and so. It is an "If" story. "If" so and so happened. I object on that foundation, that is, speculative.

DR. GAWLIK: Then I shall word my question differently.

H0928 - 0050

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Would the fact that a representative of the SD did not take part regularly, or in any part of these Tuesday conferences mean that it was not the mission of the SD to participate in measures against the Jews in France?

COLONEL BROOKHART: The witness already said the SD had nothing to do with it. I do not know where we are going on a question of this kind.

DR. GAWLIK: I shall word my question this way, then.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Did the offices that were to participate in measures against the Jews in France take part in these Tuesday conferences?

COLONEL KAREV: The witness did not take part at all in these conferences, so how does he know who took part in them there.

DR. GAWLIK: The witness was commander of the Security Police and Security Service in France.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You might ask the witness---

DR. GAWLIK: In order to save time I shall withdraw the question.

~~CAPTAIN GAWLIK: You may ask if he knows and show the basis of his knowledge, and then you can proceed.~~

DR. GAWLIK: I should like to ask another question.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I should now like to submit document No. 1226, concerning the deportation of Jews to Auschwitz on 14 July 1942. Look at the reference number, and tell me whether the SD participated in this?

A The reference number 4J again shows that the Jewish Department alone was concerned with these measures. No other department was informed in this remark. If mention is made here of a SD commander in Bordeaux, this mentioning can only refer to commandant of the SD and Security Police of Bor-

H0928-0051

deaux . It obviously shows that here again, and in the office itself, this abbreviation "SD" was used to mean SD and Security Police.

Q And who at the office of the SD and Security Police worked on these matters, the SD or the Security Police?

A This matter was taken care of neither by the SD nor the Security Police; by the SD in no case at all. The commanders were informed of this special department wherein French authorities took measures against Jews, and as a commandant he had to be informed. This document tells me that if the mention is made of Jews who were stateless,and whose number had evidently been estimated by French offices,and this number was then immediately transmitted to the Reichsministry Security Office.

Q I should like to submit to you document No. F-1235,~~xxxxxxxxxxx~~ -- RF-1235. It is a teletype of the chief of Security Police and SD in Lyon, Department BDS in Paris,and Department IV. Did the SD have any hand in the arrest of these 41 Jewish children, and the Jewish personnel?

A No.

Q In the note at the bottom a Dr. von "B", and Obersturmfuehrer Brunner. Who was Obersturmfuehrer Brunner?

A Brunner was Dannecker's successor,for Dannecker was dismissed by me in September 1942, a member of the SD of Amt III or VI.

Q I mean, of course, when he took over the office here?

A No, he was Eichmann's deputy,and worked for this special department called 4B.

Q Who was Dr. von "B"?

A Dr. von "B" does not mean anything to me. I can not tell or remember who he might have been.

Q Under No. 2, Obersturmfuehrer Roel is mentioned. Who was he?

H0928-0052

A I believe that Obersturmfuehrer Roel or Roedke or Roedpe of the Jewish Department is meant.

Q Was he member of the offices of Amt III or Amt VI?

A No.

DR. GAWLIK: No further questions.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We will adjourn, and start cross examination Monday morning.

DR. WEISGERBER: I have at least as many question as my colleague.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: What organization is that?

DR. WEISGERBER: With the Gestapo.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We will adjourn until Monday morning.

(The Commission adjourned until Monday, 3 June 1946 at 1000 hours)

-- --

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of Helmut Knochen taken on 31 May 1946.

John A. Murtha
(Reporter (pp 1-4 pp)

Alice Meehan
Reporter (pp 5-31 pp)

Pilonie A. Ahern
Reporter (pp 22-31 pp)

Rose W Cook
Reporter (pp 32-41 pp)

C J Gallagher
Reporter (pp 42-51 pp)

CERTIFIED TO:

Joseph F Tubridy
Commissioner

J. Rasumor
Commissioner

H0928-0053

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

450

COMMISSIONERS:

Mr. Igor V. Rasumov
Captain Joseph Tubridy

THE S.D.

(The Commission convened at 1115 hours)

HELMUT KNOCHEN, a witness, took the stand and testified as follows:

BY CAPTAIN TUBRIDY:

Q Your full name, please?

A Helmut Knochen.

Q Will you repeat this oath after me:

I swear by God, the Almighty and Omniscient, that I will speak the pure truth and will withhold and add nothing.

(The witness repeated the oath.)

DR. HANS GAWLIK: I questioned this witness concerning the duties, goals and methods of the S.D. in France, as well as of the parts that made up the S.D. in France. I want to state definitely that I will limit my questions to France.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q What was your duty in France?

A I was from May, 1942, Chief of the Security Police and the S.D.

Q What job did you have from 1940 to 1942 in France?

A I was in charge of an office of the Security Ministry and which at that time was organized by Standartenfuehrer Thomas.

Q How long did you have that job?

A I had that job until my appointment as chief of the Security Police, in May, 1942.

Q From when?

A After the occupation of Paris in June, 1940.

Q Under whom was the Police in France?

A The Police Administration was under the military command.

H0928-0054

Q During the whole time?

A From 1940 to 1942 entirely; but with the naming of a higher S.S and police official, part of the police duties went over to the S.S and Polizeiführer.

Q Who was your superior officer as chief of the Security Police and S.D. in France?

A The higher S.S and Police Chief, General Oberg.

Q What units were under you as chief of the Security Police and S.D. in France?

A It was usually the security commandants that were at the place, at the office of the French regional prefects. That is, the chief of a certain region. There were 16 commanders.

Q I would like now to know from you the relation of these security police and S.D. in France. Was that a united group or did the S.D. remain as a single organization?

A The S.D. remained independent within the office of the chief of the Security Police and the various commanders of Security Police detachments.

Q Do you know what is meant under "Personal Union"?

A Yes, I understand from that, the composition of various officer under one leader, under one chief.

Q And isn't it also one of the other facts that various units had to remain independent with the exception that they had one and the same chief?

A Yes, that I understand.

Q Therefore, between the Security Police, the S.D., was there such a personal union?

A Yes, it was an office --

Q I don't care for ther other; the answer is yes or no.

THE INTERPRETER: Shall I give the whole answer?

CAPTAIN TURRIDY: I don't think the record is quite clear, as it is now.

M. HENRI MONNERAY: I ask that the witness not read from the paper. He is giving testimony from notes. He has been long enough in France to

H09928-0055

know his own organization.

BY CAPTAIN TUBRIDY:

Q Will you dispense with your notes and answer without them.

A They are just a few notes, not any answers, and up to now I did not use any of them.

Q Well, could you please answer without using them?

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q How many S.D. officers were there in France?

A There were as many S.D. officers as there were commanders.

Q Did the members of the SD in France wear a uniform?

A Yes.

Q What uniform?

A The SS uniform with the SD insignia.

A Were these uniforms only worn by the SD or also by members of other organizations?

A No, the SD insignia was also worn by--

Q Answer my question yes or no --

COLONEL SMITH W. BROOKHART, JR.: The question is "Did only SD members wear the uniform?" May I sugest that this form of question may be permitted on cross examination, there is no rule that would permit Counsel to circumscribe the witness's testimony on direct? May we have full answers?

CAPTAIN TURBRIDY: We would like to have the information coming from the witness. Will you please phrase your questions so that the information will come from the witness and not phrase them in such a way that you inform the witness as what you would like to have him answer.

Q I suppose that in the English-American procedure you are supposed to answer "yes" or "no."

CAPTAIN TURBRIDY: On his direct examination, please phrase your qestions s that the information comes from the witness and not from Counsel.

BY DR. GILLIS:

Q I therefore ask were the uniforms only worn by the SD or other persons?

A Other persons also wore these uniforms.

Q Did people who did not belong to the party or other organizations wear the uniform?

A Yes.

Q What other persons were the uniform with the SD insignia?

A All that belonged to the Office of the security Police and the SD.

Q Can you tell me the number of persons that were employed by the Chief of the Security Police and the SD in all France?

A There were in all of France about 2,500.

Q How many of them were members of Amt. 3 of the Reich Security Office?

A From ten to twelve persons.

H0928-0056

Q How many of them were members of Amt. 6, the foreign information or intelligence unit.

A About 30 to 35 people.

CAPTAIN TURBRIDY: You mean of the 2,500?

DR, GAWLIK: Yes.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q In other words, even though only 60 to 65 people belonged to the SD offi of Amt. 3 and 6, between 2,400 and 2,500 persons wore the uniform of the SD in France. Is there an explanation for this?

A Yes.

Q What explanation?

A With the introduction of a higher SS and Police Leader the members of t Secret Field Police and the military personnel that worked with these police w taken over by the higher SS and Police leader. All these people, according to order, had to wear the SS uniform with the SD insignia thereon. These people were no longer members of the army and were taken over by the Security Police. The moment they left the army, they were declared essential for the Security Police. and were taken over completely by the SD, meaning that they were under the jurisdiction of the SS Police.

Q Did this lead to the fact that sometimes people who had nothing to do wi the office were considered members of the SD?

A Yes.

Q Can this be said to be true of members of the Gestapo and the Criminal Police?

A Yes for both of these.

Q Did French citizens say themselves were members of the SD?

A Yes, such cases are known.

MR MONNERAY: I am sorry to interrupt. I believe we are only interested in SD. I think the question whether or not French citizens were a member of this association is irrelevant.

DR. GAWLIK: Far be it from me to reproach French citizens with being membe of the SD. My only purpose in putting the question was not to point out that French citizens were members of the SD. Dr. Merkel just told me that the Tribunal has admitted this question.

H0928-0057

H0928-0058

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: I believe I understand your point. Are you trying to prove that French citizens were members of the SD or said they were members of the SD?

DR. GAWLIK: Just if they said they were members of the SD and I state this reason, they carried out illegal activities which the SD is now accused of carrying on.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You will have to direct the question to specific facts and incidents if that is what you are trying to po out.

DR. GAWLIK: I was just going to ask that question. My ne question is can you give me any example.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Also the number of these incidents.

DR. GAWLIK: Yes, the witness will be able to state that.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q My first question is, did French citizens style themselves to be members of the SD in order to accomplish illegal ai and my next question is can you give examples.

A Yes, such incidents have become known first from the investigation of the Criminal Police where Frenchmen tried to car out confiscations and secondly, there were also political inciden

MR. MONNERAY: The witness is only dealing with individual cases, which are not it seems to me in any way connected with the general aims of the SD.

DR. GAWLIK: A bundle of document files have been submitte in which it states that the SD has committed such and such an offense.

MR. MONNERAY: The documents presented by the prosecution this connection are official German documents which give the nam of official German SD officers, therefore, the defense counsel d not meet the objection I brought before the commission. The que tion is whether or not individual French citizens pretended to b members of the SD, a question which does not deal with the aims general purpose of the SD.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: What the defense counsel is trying to f

H0928-0059

is the fact that crimes charged against the SD were not committed by the SD, but by persons who said they were members of the SD. I would appear to be a proper defense if it could be established. Monnerey, in this case the defense counsel could use documents pr sented by the prosecution in which the SD was not involved, but French citizens pretending to be members of the SD.

DR. GAWLIK: These are just preliminary questions. I will then turn to my documents and also refer to the text in which it states the SD is alleged to have committed such and such a crime.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Counsel may proceed.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Can you give a closer description of individual incidents that you remember?

A For example, I can cite an incident where French Poli reported to the Security Police and the SD and brought along a Frenchman who said he was a member of the SD. This man had seiz 200,000 francs from French people.

Q What was not true?

A It was not true that this Frenchman had any relationship whatsoever to the SD.

Q About when did this happen?

A In the year 1943.

Q Where did this happen?

A In the area or perhaps in the city of Paadict or in t area, as the commandant reported to me.

Q Do you know of any other cases?

A I can give the best example by telling you that the office of the Commandant in Paris had such a great number of the cases to deal with that a department for these cases was establis to handle the people who alleged to be members of the SD and Ges and gave false statements as to their identity.

Q Can you express in numbers how many of these cases w handled during one month?

A No, I cannot answer that question. This matter was

H0928-0060

concern of the Paris city commandant.

Q My line of evidence now turns to the accusation that members of the SD in France took part in a number of conspiracies referring to Letter C of the Triumvirate, beginning with page 17 of the German version. What were the aims and objectives of the SD Office 3 in France?

A Department 3 received its directives from Office 3 of the Reichs Main Security office. This was true of France too because there was a personnel shortage and not all matters of Amt. 3 could be handled there, therefore the main task or the main work done there concerned itself with reports on the effect of German measures on the German population. Economic questions played a large part in this. For example, food rationing cards had been introduced. The chapter concerning the black market was an important one in the economic sector. A number of special envoys of Germany were employed, whose work very often covered the same work that had to be carried out by the administrative offices of the Economic Department in France. The main point of this was bringing about an improvement of the state of affairs existing. Labor employment also played a very important part. It would appear that such measures would have a tremendous effect on the French population and their feelings and opinions.

Q What reports did the SD hand into Amt 3 in Berlin concerning the black market and labor employment?

A There were many conflicts. The black market was to be suppressed, however if German officers had bought on the black market and then were expected to fight the black market. The same is true in the administrative sector and the propaganda sector where there were absolute contradictions where German offices were established and these offices worked according to various directives which had to be given by the German Police Office or by means of the German embassy or the propaganda unit, together with its military commandant.

Q What were the aims and objectives of the SD Amt. 6 in France?

H0928-0061

A Department 6 also received its orders from Amt. 6 of the Reichs Main Security Office. The main task of this departmen was reports on French political organizations and diverse political organizations and diverse French parties and directives. Another was the building up of an intelligence service in France, which was above all to try to get news from outside of France and to use France as a depository for such news and information.

Q While you worked in France did you know that Hitler, together with other persons, were members of a secret group or agreement to commit crimes against peace, war or humanity and to persecute Jews and Churches?

A No.

Q Do you know if other members of the SD employed in France knew of this?

A They probably knew as little as I.

Q Did you gather this from conversations you had with SD members?

A Yes.

Q Could you answer the question as to whether members of the SD employed in France took part in any such a plan?

A I do not know that any member took part in any such a plan.

Q Do you consider it impossible?

A Yes.

Q Did a member of the SD employed in France know that the war that German was waging was aggressive war.

A No.

Q Did they know that all measures which had been taken by the party leadership and state leadership were in contradicti to the international law?

A No.

Q Were the activities of the SD known to the French Government at that time.

A Yes.

H0928-0062

Q Had Petain given his agreement to the SD activities that is concerning the handling of intelligence and information matters.

A Yes.

Q Were the members of the SD employed in France convinc that Petain's government was a legal government as far as international law is concerned.

A Yes

Q Did the members of the SD employed in France have any influence on the selection of the leaders of the party and its formations in France?

A No, the SD had only been given general reports on the parties and had no influence on the regulations and directives of such parties.

Q If I understood you correctly, the SD gave only purel objective reports on party conditions in France?

A Yes.

Q Did the SD in France carry on any espionage or spying activities?

A I imagine you and I understand the same thing as to the word "Spitzel". I understand that a "Spitzel" is a man who for money or other renumeration gives out information on foreign affairs.

Q As I understand the term "Spitzel", it is a man whose main work is to hand over people to the authorities. Was this th work of the SD in France?

A No.

Q Did the SD in France check on the trustworthiness and reliability of the Termans employed in France?

A No.

Q Did elections take place in France?

A No - not that I remember.

Q I shall turn to War Crimes of which the SD has been

H0928-0063

accused in France. Rule 6 of the Triumvirate. I now turn to Letter B from Page 39 on of the German Version 6-B. My evidence is only going to confine itself to France. Were their prisoner of war camps in France?

A Yes.

Q Under whose administration and guard were these camps in France?

A. All such camps in France were solely under the jurisdiction of the Military Commander.

Q. Was the SD ever called upon to direct, manage or guard any personnel of war camps in France.

A. No, never.

Q. Did the SD in France have any special units or formations in order to select people who were undesirable for political or racial reasons and to execute them?

A. No.

Q. I now refer to Letter C of the Triumvirate, page 42 of the German version. Do you know of the decree bulletin of March 4, 1944?

A. No.

Q. I should like to submit Document PS 1650 USA 246. Who had to do with the carrying out of this decree in France, the Security Police or the SD?

A. Neither the Security Police or the SD.

Q. Then you can answer my next question. Did putting this order into effect belong to the work of the activities of the SD in France.

A. No.

Q. Can you give any definite reason for this statement? Look at the reference number.

A. This decree was issued by Amt 4.

Q. Could you explain what Amt. 4 means?

A. Amt. 4 is the executive office of the Gestapo.

Q. Did the SD in France have any executive power at all?

A. No.

Q. Was the SD employed in order to carry out this decree?

A. No.

Q. Did the members of the SD know of the existence of the decree [illegible] bulletin at all?

A. No.

Q. Can you give any definite reason for this.

A. This decree was never sent to France.

Q. I now turn to Letter D of the Triumvirate. Were there concentration

H0928-0064

camps in France?

A. Yes, there were French concentration camps in France.

Q. In order to clarify the matter, who directed these camps?

A. These concentration camps were directed by the French Government as far as I know before the year 1940.

Q. Who managed and supervised these camps?

A. The French Government and its executive offices alone.

Q. Who was responsible for sending people into the concentration camps?

A. The French Police.

Q. Did the SD have anything to do with sending people into these camps or directing these camps, such as guarding or supervising them.

A. No.

Q. Did the SD ever carry on tortures in the concentration camps?

A. No, the SD personnel never did interfere in these camps.

Q. In order to clarify, did the SD carry on any executions in the concentration camps.

A. No.

Q. What other kinds of camps were there in France?

A. There were the so-called Police Detention Camps, which were directed by the German authorities.

Q. Who managed these Police Detention Camps?

A. The Military Commandant and his Military administration.

Q. From which organization were the guards taken for these camps?

A. The guards were German soldiers and they were placed at the disposal of the camps by the German Military authorities.

Q. Did the SD have anything to do with these Police Detention Camps?

A. No.

Q. Did any change as to this take place after the institution of the higher SS and Police Fuehrer?

A. No.

Q. Were there interment camps.

A. Yes.

H0928-0065

H0928-0066

Q. Who was placed in interment camps?

A. Citizens of those countries with which Germany was at war.

Q. Who managed these Internment camps?

A. The military commandant and the military administration.

Q. Which organization gave the guards for these camps?

A. The Wehrmacht and at the order of the Military Commandant.

Q. Did the SD carry on any work or have any part at all in these Internment camps.

A. No, not that I know of.

H0928-0067

Q Did the SD manage any other prisoner camps.

A No.

Q Were there labor training camps?

A No, not in France.

Q Did the SD have prisons in France?

A No.

Q Who instituted the Wehrmacht Detention Institution?

A Also the military commandant.

Q Did the SD have anything to do with this?

A No.

Q I now refer to Letter E of the Triumvirate. Was it one of the tasks of the SD in France to have a hand in the deporting of French citizens for labor purposes into Germany?

A No.

Q Was the SD ever employed for this?

A No.

A No.

Q Would such tasks be within the scope of the activities of the SD in France?

A No.

Q Who was responsible for these measures?

A The military government. There was a special office within the ministry government called the office for Labor Enforcement.

Q I now refer to Letter F of the Triumvirate, page 47. I should like to submit the Commando order of October 14, 1942, Doc. Ps 498, U.S. Version 501. Did the execution of this commander order belong to the tasks of the SD in France.

A No.

Q Was the SD employed to arrest any of the allies who had taken part in the so-called commando activities?

A No, I don't remember of any case.

Q I refer you to No. 4 of the Order where it says: "If individual members of such commandoes fall into the hands of the Wehrmacht in any other

H0928-0068

way, they are to be handed over to the SD immediately." Your testimony is in contradiction to these statements in this decree. What can you say in reply?

A Putting this order into effect, carrying out this order would have meant an Executive action, but the SD never carried on any executive work, that was the work of the Security Police Department 4.

Q Yes, but what is your explanation for the term SD in the Commando order?

A I know that the practise was very widespread which mistakenly used the initials SD when it really meant Gestapo and Security Police.

Q Will you please look at the signature? Who signed this Commando Order?

A Hitler, personally.

Q Do you believe that even Hitler could have made this mistake?

A Yes.

Q Can you give any more definite reasons? Did this mistake of the term take place even in the highest office?

A Yes. I know that the same mistakes were made by the Commanders in Chief and by the Military Commandant.

Q You mean to say that the carrying out of this Commando order is merely an executive matter. Only the Gestapo and the Criminal Police had such executive power and the SD as an intelligence service had no such executive power and therefore could not carry out this order. Is that true?

A Yes.

Q Will you look at the distribution? Does the distribution clear up anything as to whether the Security Police or the Security Service were to carry out this order.

A It says here that the letter was directed by the distribution to the Main Office of the Security Police.

Q What offices would have to be mentioned in the distribution?

A I don't know if a specification order distribution would have been made as to Amt. 3, 4 or 6 in this order, but if it were issued by the Reichs

Hon

H0928-0069

Main Security Office it would have to be directed to Amt. 3 or 6, but I don't know if any orders which were to be carried out by executive power were ever directed to Amt. 3 and 6.

Q I should now like to submit a command of the High Command of the Army, dated August 2, 1942, P.S. 553, U.S. Version 500. Will you please read this order through and then tell me if carrying out this order belonged to the work of the SD in France?

A It was not the work of the SD to carry out the execution of this order.

Q Was the SD in France ever used to put this order into effect?

A No.

Q Can you clarify your opinion?

A The questions dealing with sabotage or counter or defense sabotage were treated by Amt. 4.

Q Perhaps you had better tell us what Amt. 4 was?

A Amt. 4 was the department that had to deal with the matter concerned with Amt. 4 of the Reichs Main Security Office.

Q I should now like to submit to you a letter of April 5, 1944, PS 385, U.S. 806. Was the carrying out of this order the work of the SD?

H0928-0070

A. No.

Q. Was the SD used to carry out this order?

A. No.

Q. Is this already evidenced by looking at the reference numbers.

A. Yes under Letter 6 it says that the Chief of Amt. 3 and 6 were being handed this order for their information only. It would have said so if carrying out this order had been one of the tasks of the SD. Amt. 3 and 6 would have had to be mentioned in Paragraph 5 and specific reference would have been made to the fact that they were to cooperate with the other offices.

Q. I don't believe you answered my question if this was proven by the reference number.

A. Yes, it is also evidenced from the reference number from the issuing office of Amt. 4.

Q. If it had belonged to the work of the SD, your reference file number would have had to be given there?

A. Yes, the reference number of a department of Amt. 3.

Q. Instead of Roman numeral 4, it would have read Roman numeral 3.

A. Yes.

Q. I now refer to a letter of June 23, 1944, dealing with the treatment of commando members with reference to the commando order of October 18, 1942. It is a teletype issued by the Commander in Chief West. It is Document 531-PS U.S. 550. Will you please look at the second last paragraph and note that it says that the cases of living members of the commandos that have fallen into our hands, are to be turned over to the SD. What do you say to that?

A. Here the SD has been confused with the Gestapo and the Security Police.

Q. I should now like to refer to Doc. 532-PS, RF 368 and 551-PS also US-551. This is the reply to the document that I have just submitted. Documents 531 and 532-PS. This order was not approved by Hitler as stated by Biddle in the testimony of April 4, 1946 in the German minutes of the Session, page 7188 and 7189. For this reason, the version of the order became Document 551. In this Document it says that members of allied or enemy forces that fall

H0928-0071

into our hands alive are to be handed over to the SD. What can you say in reply here?

A. Here too the SD cannot have been meant, but the Security Police.

Q. I should now like to submit to you a latter order of the Security Police and SD of January 5, 1945 - 535-PS, U.S.807. Please look at the date and tell me if this decree was carried out in France at all.

A. The order was issued a long time after I had been in France. I was recalled from France in August of 1944.

Q. State very briefly conditions in France after the allied landing and state whether the SD carried out any acitivities after this date.

A. After the invasion -- I might even say weeks before the invasion -- the entire command of authority was transferred to the military offices. Orders issued by the Commander in Chief West and the Military Commandant said that military offices were to be selected of which the military battle commandants were to be in charge. The work of the SD, as such, could no longer be carried out especially concerning reports to the officers as the communications to these offices had been interrupted. This was reporting solely for the information of the field commandants or by the chief of Amt. 3 for the Military Commandant in France.

Q. Could one say that the SD stocked its activities upon the landing of the allies in France.

A. Yes, one might say so for there were no further directives issued by Amt. 3.

(The Commission adjourned until 1400 hours)

H0928-0072

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

31 MAY 1946

COMMISSIONERS:

Captain Joseph Tubridy
Mr. Rasumov

(The Commission convened at 1400 hours.)

COL. NEAVE: Dr. Gawlik, before you begin your examination of the witness, I have a number of announcements to make. The Tribunal has instructed me to read the following order, which will be posted on the bulletin board in the Defense Information Center.

"First, the hearing of witnesses for organizations before the Commission will cease on Friday, July 5. Second, the Commissioners will endeavour to hear as many witnesses as possible for each organization within that period. Thirdly, applications for witnesses to be heard in Court should be made to the General Secretary as soon as the witness has been heard on Commission."

That notice will be published in the Defense Information Center by Lt. Cmdr. Scheurer. The second notice, to which I wish to direct your attention, is also going to be put on the notice board in the Defense Information Center.

It refers to witnesses or rather, prospective witnesses who have not yet arrived in Nurnberg, and it asks defense counsel to cooperate in sending in lists of the most important witnesses, so that the military authorities can give special priority to their being brought to Nurnberg.

The third thing is that the Tribunal ruled yesterday that the princip that all witnesses will be heard on Commission whether or not they are subsequently heard in Court, will be unheld, and that the application of Dr. Laterns in that respect is denied.

Finally, will defense counsel please comply with the request which was mentioned last night by Capt. Tubridy, and which should be published on

H0928-0073

the board in the Defense Information Center, that they should submit to the Commissioner a short, written statement of the matters that they wish to prove. If possible, and if there is time to do it, we shall be glad to have this translated into English beforehand, and if Defense Counsel have any difficulty about getting that done, I shall be glad to help. Would all Defense Counsel, therefore, please comply with that request?

There will be a meeting of Defense Counsel in my room at 10:00 o'clock tomorrow, Saturday morning.

THE SD

HELLUT KNOCHEN -- Continued

DIRECT EXAMINATION -- Resumed

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We will proceed with the examination.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I am now coming to single phases of the Commando order. I present to you document C-176, GW-228. It concerns two marine soldiers that were found drifting toward land in a rubber life raft. First, look at the photostatic copy.

(Witness is handed document C-176.)

On page 710 it states, "C Commander Gascogne reports the handing over of the two men with their material that was found with them at 4:15 to S. D. Bordeaux."

What did S. D. Bordeaux have to do with this case?

A S. D. Bordeaux had nothing to do with this. The real order read "Gestapo Bandits."

Q It also says here, concerning the call of the personal referendum to the Chief of the SD in Paris, "SS Obersturmfuehrer Dr. Schmitz." Who was Dr. Schmitz?

A Dr. Schmitz was the personal reference to the Chief of the Security Police and the SD.

Q Is the title, Commissioner or Chief of the SD in Paris correct?

A No.

Q What should have been the correct name?

H0928-0074

A The Commissioner or Chief of the Security Police and the SD.

Q Therefore, was the SD, that is AMT III or AMT IV, the organization or the group to take care of this?

A No, it only could have been AMT IV.

Q On the same page it continues.

"After conversations with the Chief of the Leadership staff, the SD is advised to get the permission from the headquarters director."

Is the word SD correct here?

A No.

Q How should it read.

A Office of the Security Police and SD Bordeaux.

Q On the end of the document, it says that the two British prisoners

were shot by a group from the Harbor Commissioner Boards, a group with the strength of 60 men, together with one office of the SD, on order of the Fuehrer

COL. GRIFFITH JONES: I wonder if Dr. Gawlik would tell me which documents was this presented?

CAPT TUBRIDY: Dr. Gawlik, would you give us the document reference of that document.

COL. GRIFFITH JONES: I have got the number of it, I would like to know in what Prosecution Document book it was put in, or what particular presentation.

DR. GAWLIK: I will check that.

COL. GRIFFITH JONES: Perhaps Dr. Gawlik will let me know later.

DR. GAWLIK: Yes. I think it was presented in court during the meeting in court, and I will see if I can give you the number of the periodical.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q. What do you have to say to this?

A. What was the last question.

Q. Concerning the officer of the SD that was taking part.

A. He probably was not a member of Ant III, but a member of Amt IV that handed back these prisoners to the Navy after their questioning.

Q. Maybe you can give a more specific reason why it probably was not a member of Amt III, but a member of Amt IV?

A. In this phase, it is concerning defensive questioning, and especially when it concerned matters of defense the SD did not do any questioning whatsoever.

Q. Was it part of the duties of the SD in France to take part in executions?

A. No.

Q. I now present to you a document, F-1244, same as RF-1244. It is concerning a refusal for clemency by the high court, the highest military court with the Army in France on the 6th of August 1942. Read the document.

(Document presented to witness, who reads same.)

Were those three French citizens sentenced by a court of the SD?

H0928-0075

A. No.

Q. Maybe you can give me a more specific reason for that?

A. It is clear, from the document, that it is a sentence of a court martial of the military commissioners of France. Once in Evreux, and once in Epinal.

Q. Were there any SD courts in France?

A. No.

Q. Did the SD have anything to do with the execution of witnesses?

A. No.

Q. Therefore, is the statement by the Prosecution, during the questioning of Keitel on 8 April 1946 on page 7377 of the German transcript, that he was at one time sort of an appeal court for the SD in France correct?

A. No.

Q. Can you give the reason for that? Why that is not correct?

A. From this letter, it is evident that the high military court with the military commissioner in France had rendered these sentences, and that the appeals for clemency were on a military basis to Hitler, in one case.

Q. I do not think your explanation is clear enough. This document was presented by the Prosecution to prove that Keitel actually was a sort of appeal court for the SD at times.

I ask you now, did the SD have anything to do with the sentencing and with the execution of the sentence? Who sentenced these three citizens?

A. The military courts.

Q. Who refused a clemency appeal?

A. General Field Marshall Keitel.

Q. And who executed the sentences?

A. These three men that were sentenced to death were executed in connection with the reprisal of the higher SS and police leaders. Otherwise, all three of them would have been shot by the military court, and its executive command. In other words, they were shot together, or with those that were sentenced to death in connection with the reprisal measurements.

Q. I therefore ask you now, were they shot by members of the SD or

H0928-0076

members of the other organization?

A. They were not shot by the SD.

Q. I now come to the document PS-1276, US-520. It is a letter from the Chief of the Security Police and the SD, dated 17 June 1944, and it concerns the arrest of various parachuters of French nationality in British uniforms. In the document, it is stated that these members of the commando groups were handed over to the security Police. On the original document, there is a note which reads:

"They were arrested by the SD"

This remark is from a German office. I now ask you, if it says on the original document that these members of the commando troops were handed over to the Security Police, would it necessarily mean that they were arrested by the SD?

H0928-0077

H0928-0078

A No, the remark is wrong.

(Document is shown to witness.)

LT. WHITNEY HARRIS: I think it is proper that the documents be shown to the Tribunal in order that the relation of these entries be noted. The two entries that defense counsel has reference to are in widely separated paragraphs, and I think that the witness should see the document so that he is aware of that fact.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Lt. Harris, do you have reference to this particular document?

LT. WHITNEY HARRIS: Yes, this particular document that he is referring to right now.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: May I have your objection again, Lt.Harris?

LT. WHITNEY HARRIS: Counsel has stated -- he has put a hypothetical question to the witness in asking him if the document states that these parachuters were to be turned over to the Security Police. Then the notation opposite that entry, that the arrests were made by the SD, is presumably erroneous, whereas in fact, upon the document, that notation is made opposite an entry which refers to the Security Police and the SD, in paragraph 1 of the document. In other words, I do not think that Counsel has accurately described this document in his question to the witness.

DR. GAWLIK: It says here, before the last paragraph:

"I consider it essential that the necessary orders should also be given from there in order that the individual unit of the armed forces may not, as has often been the case, interpret them wrongly and turn the commando troops over to the Security Police instead of slaughtering them in combat or if they retreat."

In this sentence I also want to point out that the Security police is mentioned, and not the SD. In other words, they were to be handed over to the Security Police and there is no mention of the SD at all.

LT. WHITNEY HARRIS: If the Court please, my whole point is that this paragraph refers to the handing over to the Security Police by the Army. It does not refer to the original arrest. Presumably, arrests could have been made by the SD and Security Police on its own, in cases where these arrests were handed over by the Army. I do not see any importance in this

H0928-0079

entry on the end of the line opposite this paragraph to which the counsel has reference. It is the first paragraph which indicates that presumably members of the SD did make arrests, presumable, since it was written, as counsel says, by a member of the SD charged with carrying out this type of order.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Then I ask the witness, did the SD have any orders to arrest people?

A No.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Just a minute. Do you concede that the prior question should be stricken out, Dr. Gawlik?

DR. GAWLIK: No, whh should it be stricken out?

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Because Lt. Harris has a point in what he says.

DR. GAWLIK: I think that there is a misunderstanding here, and I want to clear up with further questions that the SD did not have anything to do with arresting people.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Yes, but you are trying to use an incorrect entry to do that, and the document is more or less self-explanatory, and by questioning the witness in the manner that you are, a different meaning is given than would be by reading the document itself. If you want to question the witness as to whether the document states what was a common practice, then you may do so.

DR. GAWLIK: But Mr. Commissioner, I can also ask the witness concerning the remarks on the edge of the letter. The witness is the sole person who can testify because he was the Commissioner of the Security Police and SD in France, the person mentioned in this letter. The document contains a mistake with this remark. I do not know whether that is clear. The original could prove that this is a mistake.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Are you attempting to prove that this is a mistake?

DR. GAWLIK: Yes, that is the point of the questioning.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Very well.

WITNESS: May I ask a question concerning this?

DR. GAWLIK: You may state what you want to say, but you cannot ask a question.

H0928-0080

WITNESS: I notice, after this remark, a question mark, and I am wondering whether the reader was not wondering whether this arrest was made by the Security Police or by the military.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I ask you, regarding this quotation, "Therefore arrested by SD", is the remark right or wrong?

A The remark is basically wrong, because this was not the dury of the SD.

Q Read the document and tell me.

(Witness reads document.)

A Yes.

Q Who did the arresting, the Security Police or the SD?

A I suppose from this letter that it was neither the Security Police or the SD.

Q If somebody did arrest these people, who could it have been, the SD or the Security Police?

A Then the Security Police.

Q How do you explain this incorrect remark?

A That is probably because the name SD was usually used also to designate Security Police.

Q I now come to the document F-257, equl to RF-405. It is the Field Day book of the Field Command 588, concerning Staff 588.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: May I have the original?

H0928-0081

BY DR. GAULICK:

Q Look at page 2 on top. There it says:

"In the area of Issoir, where with a group one officer, nine policemen with the SD, three terrorists were arrested." It continues: "In the town of Cantal it occurred near Mammal, a larger unit of 16 field policemen with the SD and air force - during this action four terrorists were shot and arrested." What does "SD" mean in this case?

A "SD" here again means security police.

Q Did the SD have anything at all to do with this?

A No.

Q Look now on page 2 at the bottom, there it says: "One officer, 14 field policemen of the SD were grouped against the terrorists, one terrorist is being shot and thrity six persons arrested. What does "SD" mean in this case?

A "SD" again points to the security police.

Q Did the SD have anything to do with that?

A Nothing whatsoever.

Q In order to save time, I don't want to talk about the individual cases in this day book in which the SD is being mentione Will you look on page 4, page 8, page 79, page 81? In all of these cases who is meant by the "SD"?

A In all of these cases the group which this means is Amt four of the Security Police.

Q In all of these cases did the SD have anything to do with it?

A No.

Q I just want to mention the remark on page 58 especially. This remark is concerning a case sent in by the Prefect of Lecturn as to whether wounded prisoners could be brought in as prisoners of war. The Headquarters or Head Command decided that these wounded are to be treated like bandits or partisans and to be turned over to the Obwehr of the SD. Who is meant by the SD in this case?

H0928-0082

A Once again in this case that Amt four refers to the military Abwehr.

Q Did the SD interior or foreign information group or intelligence groups have anything to do with this case?

A No.

Q Could the officers of the foreign or interior intelligence group, could they have done anything with these wounded?

A No, they were not informed at all concerning the question of terrorists and what is to be done with them.

H0928-0083

Q Do you have anything at all to say in regard to this remark?

A I only want to state that the fighting of terrorists was also a job of the military abwehr or defense and from what I have seen in this war log book I have noticed that the general diagram for corresponding area commanders are at command posts in each of these cases. The security police and military abwehr were doing their duty here in order to strengthen group 1, I believe.

Q I now present you document 547 equal to RF 393 in the French language. Will you lookat the second page? There it is regarding the SD is mentioned, and tell me whether once again it was a mistake with the SD and that actudly the security police is meant?

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Does the Prosecution have the document?

DR. GAULICK: No.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Would youlike to look at this document?

M. MONNERAY: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You may proceed.

BY DR. GAULICK:

Q I asked the question whether or not here once again there has been a mistake in identity, that is, whether once again the security police is meant by SD?

A Yes, once again there is a mis-statement in the translation.

Q I now present to you Our Document 110, USA 333, it is concerning an order according to which persons that had lynched allied fliers are to be protected. Was this an order of Himmler in regard to the French?

A No.

Q For what reason?

A There were not enough Germans in France to make this order worth while, and for the French population that order was not of any importance.

Q I now come to Figure"G" of the Trial Brief on page 48 of the German. It is called "Nacht und Nebel". I present to you this document L-90, USA 503, that is the "Nacht und Nebel" order of the 12 December, 1941, together with the directions of use, or how that is supposed to be carried out from the 2 February, 1942, from the High Command of the Army and called a directive of 2 February, 1942, as to how it is to be carried out. Was the SD

H0928-0084

used in France to carry out these orders and these directives?

A No.

Q I now put before you the order of the Chief of the Security Police of the SD of the 24 June, 1942. It is the document PS 668, USA 504. Was the SD used in the execution of the measures that are contained in this order?

A No.

Q I present you four more orders concerning this "Nacht and Nebel" order. It is a secret order from Hitler of the 30 July 1944 from the High Command of the Army of the 2nd of September, 1944, the 18th of August, 1944, or from the 8, 18th, 1944. They are documents 762, GB 298, PS 835, USA 528, 763 GB 300 and D764, GB 299. Please read through these documents and tell me whether these orders were carried out in France and if they were carried out, whether they were carried out by the SD?

A I do not know anything concerning the execution of these orders. I do not know also whether my successor received these orders. If these orders went to the higher SS and police leaders and Chief of the Security Police, then it was not the duty of the SD to carry out these orders. Whether or not the SD was yet in France after August, 1944, or whether it had been pulled out by that time, I do not know. I only know that the Chief up to then of Amt [illegible], I know that he was pulled out of France at the same time, and I don't know whether a successor had been named for him.

Q When was the leader of group 3 recalled?

H0928-0085

A Also around the 20th of August.

Q Now, please look at the document D-762, that is no.2. To whom were the terrorists and saboteurs to be handed over?

A The nearest local office of the security police and the SD.

Q And who were these officers who were in charge of the security police of SD.

A Group 4, because it's duties were concerning terror activities and sabotage activities.

Q Now look at the Document D-763. There it says they are to be handed over to the SD.

A In this case only it can be once again the so often mentioned error, that because of the shortness of "SD", there is a mistake and it was supposed to mean security police and SD offices.

Q Now, look at Document D-764. What does it mean concerning the handing over to the SD for work use?

A It could be that these persons were supposed to be handed over to work camps of the State Police or that they came into the scope of the work of the organization Sonderkommando? I ought to say this order, it would not have been possible to effect this order in France, since in France there were no German work education camps and that the security police did not work together with the organization Sonderkommando? on this work.

Q If you say the SD had nothing to do with it, how do you explain the sentence: "To the SD for work use?"

A I declare that it was once again the same before mentioned error, and in this document it is wrong, in 5-A. It is correct in No.4, as it should have been it is in No.4, but in 5-A it is incorrect.

Q Did the SD work together with the German work organization or the French organizations that were to provide persons for this work organization?

A The SD had nothing to do with the carrying out of such orders. He did, however, report concerning the orders and the feeling of the French population concerning these orders?

(A recess was taken)

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We may as well proceed.

H0928-0086

BY DR. GAULICK:

Q You testified that the SD only reported on labor and finances, were these reports purely objective ones?

A Yes, theh were reports of sentiment and opinion, and at the same time, the number of manpower which had been requested and recruited was included.

Q These reports were then objective reports on public feeling and opinions concerning the measures taken on labor employees, that is correct?

A Yes, they reported on information and intelligence reports which had been received concerning measures taken by French and German authorities.

Q I should now like to submit to you an order by the Army High Command on 4 September, 1944, concerning the "Nacht und Nebel" decree, as No.D-766, GB 301. Will you please look at it and tell me whether this decree became in France -

M. MONNERAY: I object. I think if the witness wasn't in France he could not testify.

DR. GAULICK: Then my question will run as follows:

Q Witness, do you know whether any German officers at all were still doing duty in France in September of the year 1944?

A Yes.

Q Can you answer the questions as to whether this decree was put into effect in September, 1944?

A No, I cannot.

Q Summarizing, do you want to say, if in these documents we find repeated notes concerning the handing over of persons to the SD in France, would you say that these notes were misleading?

A Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Was he working in France in the years subsequent to 1942?

DR. GAULICK: Until 1944.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Will you limit your questions and the witnesses testimony up to the period of time when he was in France?

DR. GAULICK: The witness was in France until a short time before the Allied Occupation of France.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Well, my point is this: Dr. Gaulick, will you repeat your last questions?

BY DR. GAULICK:

Q Is the remark "handing over of persons to the SD in France" a remark which we find on numerous documents, a misleading one?

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You mean documents submitted to him or in all documents?

DR. GAULICK: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: And in the documents which have been submitted to him?

DR. GAULICK: Yes.

BY DR. GAULICK:

Q What is the meaning of "handing over to the SD"?

A This means handing over to the executive departments of department 4 of the security police.

Q Is it, therefore, correct to say, as the Prosecution has maintained, I refer to one document of the minutes of the meeting of 6 April 1946, document P7290, handing over to the SD means "handing people over to be sent in to concentration camps and executed?" The question refers to France and to the time in which you were in France?

A No, it is not correct.

Q Can you give any reason for your answer?

A My reason for the answer is that SD work was carried out by Amt III and Amt VI. This work was taken care of by station area offices in France, and these departments never had any executive powers.

H0928-0088

Q I now read to you letter "K" of the trial brief, page 51, whereas this concerns the seizure. Who confiscated the religious, scientific, and art archives in France?

A Every confiscation was carried through by the military government.

Q Did the SD have any power of seizure in France?

A No.

Q Did the SD have ahand in the seizures?

A No, not that I know of.

Q I now refer to third degree hearing letter "L" of the trial brief. Did the SD in France carry on any hearings or examinations?

A No.

Q Did the SD in France have the right to carry on hearings and examinations?

A No, the SD did not have this right.

Q Did the SD carry out the third degree interrogations?

A No.

Q Did the SD in France hand over people for examination and interrogations to any other offices of a military or police character?

A No.

Q I now turn to crimes against humanity. Concerning the persecution of Jews in France. What measures were taken against the Jews in France?

A Laws were issued in France by the German authorities of the offices of the military commander, as well as the French laws of the

H0928-0089

French authorities concerning Jews.

Q Who caused the Jews to be deported from France?

A These deportations were carried out at Himmler's initiative, who had given corresponding directives to military government, and against whom the administrative orders were directed.

Q Which German office had a hand in this matter?

A This was taken in by the so-called Jewish Department of the Reich Main Security Office to a special department in charge of which was Obersturmbannfuehrer Eichmann, who had these deputies in France. It was organized as belonging to Amt IV. Eichmann's Deputy was associated with the German embassy, with the military commanders, and with the French authorities. There were divers numbers of officers and military commanders who had a hand in this.

Q Was there any connections at all between this deputy of Eichmann and the S

A No.

Q I should now like to submit document RF 1216 to you concerning the deportation of five-thousand Jews from France. Did the SD have any hand in this?

A No.

A No.

Q Can you give any more specific reasons for that?

A Because this Jewish question was not concerned with the SD, and consequent the SD did not have to work on these questions.

Q I should now like to submit document F-1207 --RF 1207, a report on the Jewish question in France, and its treatment. Please turn to page 70. The photostatic in not signed. It only states Obersturmfuehrer. Can you tell us who issued this report?

A The report must have been written by Obersturmfuehrer Dannecker in 1944.

Q was Dannecker a member of the SD?

A I only know that he took care of all these questions at the order of Amt I

Q Was he Eichmann's immediate subordinate?

A Yes.

Q And received immediate instructions, or direct instructions from Eichmann in Berlin?

A Yes.

Q Please turn to page 1. On page 1 it states the title which reads as follows "Final solution of Jewish question, and aim of the Jewish actions of the Departme

of the SD, and its security police in France." Considering this heading, my question is, did the SD have anything to do with this handling of the Jewish Question Department?

A No, as such the SD had nothing to do with this department for Jewish questions. Of course, the Department III received orders or measures against Jews as many other offices in France also did.

Q Please turn to page 18. There it says, "The man in charge of the departmen for Jewish matters demanded the institution of a Jewish newspaper." According to that statement there was a man of the SD who was concerned with Jewish matter

M. MONNERAY: What page is that?

DR GAWLIK: 18.

THE WITNESS: I can only explain by saying that the author of this report used the term "SD" without supplementing it, or, that he used the term "SD" of his own accord.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I don't quite understand. My question is, was this man who was in charge of the Jewish question Department a member of the SD, or was he of the SD?

A I don't know whether he was a member of the SD. We only know that he worked at the orders of Amt IV, and for Amt IV.

Q If he had formerly been a member of the SD, and was now working for Amt IV of this referat, that would mean he was no longer a member of Amt III which is identical of SD, is that true.

A Yes.

Q What explanation can you give for this expression "Juden-referat for the SD," a man in charge of Jewish questions for the SD. Read the question through.

A I presume that his term was used by various offices, German and French offices, as meaning a representative of the Reich Main Security Office, and it is representative of the Reich Main Security Police and the SD.

Q Was this man a deputy of the chief of the Security Police and SD?

A No, this man came directly under the orders of Eichmann of Amt IV, and he operated very much with Himmler's decrees, and Himmler's orders.

Q Will you explain, why if this man came from Amt IV, he was called Juden Referent, that is Amt III?

A The explanation for this is again, that in the course of conversations that

this man may have had the military an political authorities of the same mistake designation was given as member of the SD without making or going to the trouble of making a distinction between Departments III and VI, which was the information and intelligence department.

H0928-0091

H0928-0092

Q Did Amt IV belong to the Security Police, would you say that is correct?

A Yes, it was the Gestapo office.

Q Have I understood you correctly? Do you mean to say that here too the term "SD" was meant to designate an office of the Security Police?

A Yes, surely.

Q Would this be true of all cases wherein this report the mention is made of the man in charge of the Jewish question?

A Yes.

Q Turn to page 27, the third line from the top. It says "Obersturmfuehrer Dannacker said "That here we are only concerned with solving the question generally, and that the SD must have possibilities of executing the orders transmitted to it. These orders of the Reich Main Security Office were the final solution orders. We mean directed against the extermination of the Jews, and the SD was to carry out these orders." What can you say in reply?

A The SD had nothing to do with the question, as they held in the entire question of Jewish immigration or deportation, as this was the special task of the special Referat department. The SD had nothing to do with this here. It is a mistake, or I might perhaps say it is a negligent work where a short designation as "D" was used for SD and Security Police.

Q Turn to the last paragraph on page 27. There it says, "Therefore, the information given by Ministerialrat Dr. Storz is important with the directions -- with the work of Vallat, and future directions in this matter are to be handled by the SD." What does the "SD" mean here?

A Here it means Jewish Special Department for the SD, which as I already testified had nothing to do with this matter.

Q Turn to page 68. Here mention is made of concentration camp actions, according to which the French Police took into custody the 3,000 Jews. Did the SD in France have anything to do with this measure?

A No.

Q I should like to submit to you a document No. F-1219, and also one No. F-1217. These documents concern deportation of Jews from France. Please read these documents after looking at the reference number, and tell me

H0928-0093

whether the SD in France had anything to do with these transports of Jews?

A No. The SD had nothing to do with these measures. This is evident from the reference numbers, Amt IV, and, secondly, that the head of Department III was not informed of this, and head of Department IV likewise was not informed.

Q In both the documents, Nos. 1217 and 1219, is this shown by the reference numbers?

A Reference number 4J shows that there can be no question of an SD department here.

Q What would be the reference number if the SD had had a part in these measures?

A The reference number would have been begun with the number 3.

Q I should like now to submit document F-1210 to you, entitled, "Jews" dated 22 February 1942. Under No. 1 it shows "Task of the Security Police in France." Can you by reason of this document tell me, or give reasons whether the SD had anything to do with the Jewish measures in France?

A Yes, I can. This is again evident from the reference number 4 J. Furthermore, there is a mark saying, that it is being put on file at Amt IV. It might be that this is the reference number of the Reich Security Office. So far as I know Jewish questions were filed under 4 B, but it might have been later. At any rate, it shows that this is a matter concerned with "4" as is shown by the reference number.

Q Further on mention is made in this document of "Tuesday conferences in Paris." What was the purpose of these Tuesday conferences.

A So far as I know I myself never took part in any of these Tuesday conferences. The purpose was to inform all offices concerned, and to keep them informed by means of these conferences.

Q Which were?

A The work that had to be done by the German aithorities in order to solve and settle the question that helped the French authorities to take care of the deportation of Jews.

Q Did the SD take part in these Tuesday conferences?

A I do not believe so.

H0928-0094

Q Is this not shown by the document?

A In this document only the departments taking regular part in these conferences were mentioned, as the military authorities, the readministrative offices, the German Embassy, and the actions Einsatzstab and the group west Rosenberg. There is no mention of the special representative of the SD.

Q If it had been the commission of the SD to take part in the transporting and deportation of Jews from France, would the representatives of the SD have taken part regularly in these Tuesday conferences?

A Yes.

COLONEL BROOKHART: I object and ask it be stricken. He asked if that is to be so and so. It is an "IF" story. "If" so and so happened. I object on that foundation, that is, speculative.

DR. GAWLIK: Then I shall word my question differently.

H0928-0095

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Would the fact that a representative of the SD did not take part regularly, or in any part of these Tuesday conferences mean that it was not the mission of the SD to participate in measures against the Jews in France?

COLONEL BROOKHART: The witness already said the SD had nothing to do with it. I do not know where we are going on a question of this kind.

DR. GAWLIK: I shall word by question this way, then.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Did the offices that were to participate in measures against the Jews in France take part in these Tuesday conferences?

COLONEL KAREV: The witness did not take part at all in these conferences, so how does he know who took part in them there.

DR. GAWLIK: The witness was commander of the Security Police and Security Service in France.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You might ask the witness - -

DR. GAWLIK: In order to save time I shall withdraw the question.

DR. GAWLIK: I should like to ask another question.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I should now like to submit document No.1226, concerning the deportation of Jews to Auschwitz on 14 july 1942. Look at the reference number, and tell me whether the SD participated in this?

A The reference number 4 J again shows that the Jewish Department alone was concerned with these measures. No other department was informed in this remark. If mention is made here of a SD commander in Bordeaux, this mentioning can only refer to commandant of the SD and Security Police of Bordeaux. It obviously shows that here again, and in the office itself, this abbreviation "SD" was used to mean SD and Security Police.

Q And who at the office of the SD and Security Police worked on these matters, the SD or the Security Police?

A This matter was taken care of neither by the SD nor the Security Police; by the SD in no case at all. The commanders were informed of this special department wherein French authorities took measures against Jews, and as a commandant he had to be informed. This document tells me that if the

H0928-0096

mention is made of Jews who were stateless, and whose number had evidently been estimated by French offices, and this number was then immediately transmitted to the Reichsministry Security Office.

Q I should like to submit to you document NoF-1235, - - RF-1235. It is a teletype of the chief of Security Police and SD in Lyon, Department BDS in Paris, and Department IV. Did the SD have eny hand in the arrest of these 41 Jewish children, and the Jewish personnel?

A No.

Q In the note at the bottom a Dr. von "B", and Obersturmfuehrer Brunner, Who was Obersturmfuehrer Brunner?

A Brunner was Dannecker's successor, for Dannecker was dismissed by me in September 1942, a member of the SD of Amt III or VI.

Q I mean, of course, when he took over the office here?

A No, he was Eichmann's deputy, and worked for this special department called 4B.

Q Who was Dr. von "B"?

A Dr. von "B" does not mean anything to me. I cannot tell or remember who he might have been.

Q Under No.2, Obersturmfuehrer Roel is mentioned. Who was he?

A I believe that Obersturmfuehrer Roel or Roedke or Roedpe of the Jewish Department is meant.

Q Was he member of the offices of Amt III or Amt VI?

A No.

DR. GAWLIK: No further questions.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We will adjourn, and start cross examination Monday morning.

DR. WEISGERBER: I have at least as many question as my colleague.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: What organization is that?

DR. WEISGERBER: With the Gestapo.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We will adjourn until Monday morning.

(The Commission adjourned until Monday, 3 June 1946 at 1000 hours)

H0928-0097

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of Helmut Knochen taken on 31 May 1936.

John Murtha
Reporter

Alice Meehan
Reporter

Pidjani A. Ahuna
Reporter

Rose W. Cook
Reporter

C. J. Gallagher
Reporter

CERTIFIED TO:

Joseph F Tubridy
Commissioner

J. Rasumov
Commissioner